

**REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, claims 7 and 13 are objected to based on the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants amend these claims, as indicated herein, and Applicants believe that the Examiner's objections to claims 7 and 13 are obviated.

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0084291).

**§ 101 Rejections - Claims 1-14**

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 based on the reasons set forth on pages 2-3 of the present office action.

Applicants' representatives thank the Examiner for discussing the rejections of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants believe that claims 1-14 satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 101.

**§ 102(e) Rejections (Yamamoto) - Claims 1-14**

Claims 1-14 are rejected over Yamamoto based on the reasons set forth on pages 3-5 of the present office action. Applicants traverse these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that Yamamoto does not disclose or suggest at least, "generating a domain secret key using the set domain identification information," as recited in claim 1. Numbered paragraph 45 of Yamamoto discloses that a first device generates common information, which allegedly corresponds to the claimed domain secret key. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that said domain secret key is generated using set domain identification information. To anticipate a claimed invention, a single

reference must satisfy each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Here, clearly this particular feature is not satisfied by Yamamoto. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that Yamamoto does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants submit that independent claims 2, 3, 9, are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 4-8 and 10-14 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 3 and 9.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: June 14, 2007